

Remarks

Referring to paragraphs 3 to 7 of the Examiner's Office Action, applicants have amended the rejected claims so that they now are directed to statutory subject matter. The Examiner will also note that claims 11 to 17 and 21 have been deleted.

Turning to paragraphs 8 etc, Examiner has cited Sun's "Jini Specifications Archive - v1.0" under 35 USC 102 as disclosing the features of each and every claim of the present invention. Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to an adaptive software interface which is able to mediate between different versions of interface definitions (see page 1, lines 7-9 of the present application). The problem addressed by the invention is that when using conventional IDLs (Interface Definition Languages) to generate software interfaces, different versions of interface definitions may use a different format for meta data which is used to describe interface characteristics. A problem is that entities having interfaces defined using different IDLs may appear to be wholly or partially incompatible with each other because of differences in format, whereas there actually is compatibility between the interfaces - see pages 1 and 2 of the description of the present application.

The solution of the present invention, as presented in claim 1, is to use structured meta data providing at least one semantic information element describing the characteristic of each of at least two entities, to collate and analyze the semantic information elements to establish the extent to which the interface capabilities of the entities are compatible, and to generate an adaptive software interface in accordance with the established compatibility. By using meta data providing at least one semantic element (as opposed to a purely syntactic information element) the

meaning of characteristics can be used to determine compatibility rather than the format or syntax of any IDL used to generate the meta data. Furthermore, by generating an adaptive software interface component with the established compatibility, it is possible for two entities to communicate despite having interface definitions (i.e. meta data) defined using different formats.

The Examiner cites various passages from the specification of the Jini Lookup Service as anticipating claim 1 and dependent claims. However, the Jini Lookup Service is a facility "for services to advertise their availability and for would-be clients to obtain references to those services based on the attributes they provide" (LS.1 introduction, lines 1-2). In other words, the Jini Lookup Service is like a business service telephone directory but for software services. It enables one entity to look up another entity based on a functional description of its needs - "In precise terms, a lookup service maps interfaces indicating functionality provided by a service to a set of objects that implement the service." (see AR.2.1.1 "Lookup Service").

The Examiner will be aware that to prove anticipation, a prior art reference must disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, whether explicitly or inherently (see Hazani v. International Trade Comm'n, 126 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1358, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). At the very least, the Jini reference does not disclose the feature of "analyzing said collated semantic information elements to establish the extent to which the interface capabilities of said at least two network entities are compatible" nor the feature of "generating in accordance with said established compatibility the adaptive software interface for the two entities". The Jini Lookup Service is merely a service for looking up an object or instance that can perform a desired function. There is no description in the Jini specifications of analyzing collated semantic information elements to establish the extent to which the interface capabilities of at least two networked entities are compatible, and there is certainly no description of generating the adaptive software interface in accordance with the established compatibility. The Jini Lookup Service merely identifies an


object that can provide desired functionality. On this basis, claims 2 to 10, 18 to 20, 22 and 26 are also not anticipated at least in respect of their dependency on or recitation of similar features to Claim 1.

Turning to claims 23 to 25, the Applicants fail to understand the Examiner's objections contained in paragraphs 31 to 33 of the Office Action. Regarding claim 23, the Examiner merely cites section LU.1.1 "The Lookup Service Model", lines 1-10 and section LU.1.2 "Attributes", lines 1-9 of the JINI specification. If the Examiner intends to continue with this rejection, he is kindly requested to specifically identify which passage in the prior art cited discloses the feature of "the semantic description having a predetermined structure which is invariant regarding the version of compiler used to generate said semantic description". Until the Examiner provides this clarification, applicants are unable to understand the nature of the rejection made.

Applicant believes the present invention is novel and non-obvious in view of the prior art cited by the examiner and requests favorable reconsideration of the application.

April 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)

CHDS01 WLEB 265833v1